

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action dated May 26, 2010.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

In response to the rejections maintained in the recent Office Action, claims 1 and 15 have been amended to specify that the alias registration is a unique alias registration for every competition entry performed by the sensing device. Basis for this amendment can be found at page 28, lines 31-35.

The Applicant contests the Examiner's assertion that the present invention is obvious in view of the combined teachings of Norris, Braun, Pradhan, Lieberman and Nishida. Notwithstanding the fact that the Examiner has used no less than five prior art documents in order to allege obviousness, the Applicant submits that Nishida fails to teach the claim feature of:

wherein the alias registration is a unique alias registration for every competition entry performed by the sensing device.

An advantage of allocating a unique alias registration for every competition entry is explained at page 29, lines 4-8 of the specification, where it is stated:

A user's competition alias ID may be unique to a netpage user and competition ID combination. In other words a netpage user would have a unique competition alias ID for each competition they entered. If a manufacturer were running more than one competition then the user would have more than one competition alias id. The manufacturer would not be aware of the connection between the competition alias IDs unless the user opted in and revealed their identity for each competition.

Nishida teaches the use of an alias corresponding to a user ID. The alias has corresponding return address for sending e-mails. However, there is no suggestion in Nishida that the alias should be a unique alias registration for every competition entry performed by a sensing device.

Since this feature of the present invention is not taught anywhere by Nishida (or, indeed, in Norris, Bran, Pradhan and Lieberman), then it is submitted that the present invention is not obvious in view of the cited prior art.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,



Kia Silverbrook, Managing Director

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: pair@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762